

4440 E. Quivira Place
Tucson, AZ 85718
March 26, 2004

FCC
Washington, DC

Re: RM 10867, 10868, 10869, 10870

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I have been an amateur radio operator since the 1970s. My call sign is WN8PEE.

The proposed rule making promotes a general “dumbing-down” of our hobby.. Being an amateur radio operator is grounded in tradition and effort. The purpose of the amateur service, in my opinion, is not to have as many licensees as possible, but to have those that are dedicated enough to work hard and do the study required to join the ranks. Generally, this hard work promotes a well-behaved group. If this proposed rule making becomes a reality, then there is only one step to follow after it, and that is just to issue a license to anyone that can fill the form out.

During my decades of operation, I have seen a general decrease in the ability and quality of operators on the air. This is coincident with the general downgrade of requirements for the license.

We have hundreds of thousands of licensed amateur radio operators in this country, so the previous requirements for a license cannot be too far a field. I’m afraid that this effort for restructuring is driven by the manufactures of amateur radio equipment and organizations that derive their income from the amateur service and not from the amateur community. I have read their arguments and they are couched in double-speak about how this proposed rule making would benefit the service. This rule making will not benefit the service but downgrade it even farther.

Relative to the code requirement, human beings have been learning the code since the early days of the telegraphers. It requires some effort. And frankly, it is a filter that keeps those not so serious about the hobby out. Expecting excellence is a good thing. An amateur radio license should never be issued without this requirement. Furthermore, issuing HF privileges without a code requirement, would just “CB” up the amateur HF segments, and in my opinion should be rejected by any reasonable thinking.

I hope the Commission comprehends the downgrade of the amateur service that these proposed changes in the rules would cause and rejects them out-of-hand. Arguments such as mine have been attacked as “emotional.” This is partly true. But also, my arguments are based on experience and years of observation within the amateur community.

Thank you for your attention and I hope we can count on you to preserve the present quality of our service.

Donald Clouse